



**THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re the Application of: **Ryoichi KAWADA et al.**

Group Art Unit: **2621**

Application No.: **10/620,350**

Examiner: **Tung T. Vo**

Filed: **July 17, 2003**

Confirmation No.: **8925**

For: **IMAGE MATCHING DEVICE AND METHOD FOR MOTION  
PICTURES**

Attorney Docket Number: **030838**

Customer Number: **38834**

**RESPONSE TO ELECTION OF SPECIES REQUIREMENT**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

February 13, 2007

Sir:

This paper is submitted in response to the Official Action dated January 12, 2007.

Applicants hereby elect to prosecute the Species I (Claims 1, 3 and 5). This election is made with traverse. It is respectfully submitted that a thorough search and examination of species I would also encompass the search and examination of Species II and III. As such, it is believed that the search and examination of Species I-III can be made without serious burden. See MPEP §803 which states that "[i]f the search and examination of all the claims in an application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine them on the merits, even though they include claims to independent or distinct inventions". (emphasis added). It is requested that this policy apply to the present application to avoid duplicative examination by the Examiner and undue cost to applicants.

Application No. 10/620,350  
Art Unit 2621



Response to Election of Species Requirement  
Attorney Docket No. 030838

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. If any additional fees are due in connection with this paper, please charge Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

**WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP**

Stephen G. Adrian  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 32,878  
Telephone: (202) 822-1100  
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

SGA/arf